

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-4, 8-10, 12, and 18-24 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 22 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 12, and 22 are sought to be amended in order to clarify the invention. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Interview

Applicants' representative expresses appreciation for the telephone interview granted by Examiner Deppe on August 14, 2008, where paragraph 3 of the Office Action, dated 4/9/2008, was discussed. In accordance with the telephone interview, claims 1 and 22 have been amended to change *components* to *transmission lines*, in order to clarify the claimed invention. As discussed in the phone interview, Claims 1 and 22 are at least supported by FIGs. 3B-3C, paragraph 28, and originally filed claim 11.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-4, 8-10, 12, and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants traverse below.

At paragraph 7, the Office Action alleges that the specification does not describe the transmitter de-emphasis circuit has "having an active configuration." Applicant disagrees, and refers to FIG. 1, and the transconductance devices 120,122 that are active

devices. However, in order to further prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to remove this feature.

At paragraph 10, claims 1-4,8-10, 12, and 18-21, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C., 2nd paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirements. Applicants traverse below.

At paragraph 10, the Office Action alleges that it is unclear what is meant by the transmitter de-emphasis circuit "having an active configuration." Applicant disagrees that this is unclear in light of the specification, and refers to FIG. 1, where the transconductance devices 120,122 that are active devices. However, in order to further prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to remove this feature.

Further, at paragraph 11, the Office Action alleges that the claim terms "first and second components of the differential transmission line" in claims 1 and 22 are unclear. Applicant's have amended claim 1 to change *first and second components* to *first and second transmission lines* to further clarify the claim, as was discussed in the telephone interview held on August 14, 2008. As discussed in the phone interview, claims 1 and 22 are at least supported by FIGs. 3B-3C, paragraph 28, and originally filed claim 11.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,212,229 to Salinger (hereinafter "Salinger") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,275,358 to Winglet (hereinafter "Winglet"). Applicant traverses this rejection based on the discussion below.

Claim 22 recites a data link system where the *transmission line* is *differential*, and so that the *equalizer* includes *an inductor between first and second transmission lines of said differential transmission line*. (See, claim 22, *emphasis added*)

Neither Salinger nor Winglet teaches or suggests or *an equalizer that includes an inductor between first and second transmission lines of said differential transmission line*. The Office Action admits that Salinger does not teach this particular feature, and relies on Winglet. However, upon review of Winglet, it is noted that the inductor L1 in FIG. 1 of Winglet (U.S. Patent 4,275,358) is between a capacitor C1 and ground to provide an impedance Z. (See, Winglet, FIG. 1. col.2, lines 27-3). Since Winglet is using its inductor to create an impedance to ground, then Winglet does not provide an inductor between *first and second transmission lines* of a differential transmission line. Since the ground potential prohibits signal transmission on a differential transmission, Winglet even teaches away from Applicant's claimed invention. Accordingly, the combination of Salinger and Winglet does not teach or suggest at least the feature of *an equalizer coupled to said output of said differential transmission line, including an inductor between first and second transmission lines of said differential transmission line*, as recited in Applicants' claim 22. Therefore, the combination of Salinger and Winglet does not support a *prima facie* obviousness rejection. (See, MPEP 2143A) Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 22 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that this claim be passed to allowance. Claims 23 and 24 are patentable over the cited art for being dependent on an allowable base claim, in addition to their own patentable features.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 9/24/08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

875248_1.DOC